DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 436 95 JC 770 167

AUTHOR Swain, Rufus S.
TITLE Faculty Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction and Management by Objectives for Results.
INSTITUTION Wilson County Technical Inst., N.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 76
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Job Satisfaction; *Junior Colleges; *Management by Objectives; Management Systems; Organizational Change; Organizational Climate; Organizational Development; School Surveys; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study of faculty job satisfaction and dissatisfaction was conducted at Wilson County Technical Institute subsequent to the adoption of a Management by Objectives and Results (MBO/R) organizational development plan. Three samples of faculty were surveyed in 1972, 1974, and 1976 using a measurement instrument based on the behavioral theories of Herzberg, and resultant data were analyzed to determine if any significant differences existed between the three sets of faculty responses. Significant differences were found on nine of the survey items. In all but one instance, decreases in the level of dissatisfaction of faculty were noted. Overall, faculty showed increased levels of job satisfaction relating to their supervisors, job responsibilities, and growth opportunities. While not statistically significant, improvements were indicated in such areas as achievement, policy and administration, recognition, and working conditions. No increases in dissatisfaction in any of the areas measured by the survey instrument were found. It was concluded that implementation of the Management by Objectives and Results program was not achieved at the expense of faculty satisfaction. Tabular data are included in the report. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135436

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Faculty Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction and Management by Objectives For Results

This paper was written as a management development activity as part of a Wilson County Technical Institute project and supported by the Basic Institutional Development Program, Title III, Higher Education Act of 1965.

by

Rufus S. Swain

December 1976

JC 770 167

Introduction

In the Spring of 1972, Wilson County Technical Institute participated in a doctoral research project conducted by Olin Wood entitled, "An Analysis of Faculty Motivation to work in the North Carolina Community College System."[1] It is significant that a new chief administrative officer had assumed his responsibilities at the Institute just prior to the time the Olin Wood survey of the faculty was conducted, thus providing the new administrator with some data concerning the level of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction at the time of his arrival and prior to the implementation of organizational change. The new chief administrator implemented an organization development program, using Management by Objectives and Results (MBO/R) as the basic management program of the institute.

Subsequently, it was decided to readminister the Olin Wood survey at the Institute, in January 1974, and again in October 1976, to determine any changes in the variables purportedly measured by the instrument in 1972. This was considered appropriate since the items on the scale appeared to be closely related with the behavioral outcomes sought in the MBO/R program being implemented at the institute. In fact, MBO/R was inspired partially by the behavioral theories of Herzberg, whose work provided the basis of the Olin Wood instrument.

This is a report of the findings of the repeated tests indicated above.

The Instrument

The questionnaire provided by Wood consisted of nine demographic items, one item of general rating of job satisfaction-dissatisfaction, and sixty-nine items grouped into ten classifications based on factors selected from Herzberg's list of job satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Five of the factors (achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and possibility of growth) were identified by Herzberg[2] as motivators or causes of satisfaction, and five (organizational policy and administration, supervision, salary, working conditions, and interpersonal relations) were listed as hygiene factors or causes of dissatisfaction. The items were arranged to form a seventy item modified Likert scale with six scoring categories as follows: 1- very dissatisfied, 2- moderately dissatisfied, 3- slightly dissatisfied, 4- slightly satisfied, 5- moderately satisfied, and 6- very satisfied.

Procedures:

The items on the survey were administered on three occasions:

1. Spring 1972, to 13 randomly selected instructors designated by Olin Wood for his dissertation.
2. January 1974, to 25 faculty members.
3. October 1976, to 42 faculty members.

All faculty responses were coded on IBM data cards. Percentages of faculty responses in each of the six categories (1-6) for each of the three testing periods were calculated.

The null hypothesis that no significant differences existed among the six categories of the scale across the three testing periods was analyzed by the 3 x 6 chi square analysis. The level of significance set

was at the P.05 level of confidence. The chi square values for each item are reported in Table 1.

Table 1: Chi square values for each item in the Satisfaction-dissatisfaction Scale.

Item	χ^2
Achievement	
1. The actual achievement of work-related goals	15.65
2. The immediate results from your work	9.17
3. The actual adoption of practices which you recommend	18.74*
4. Personal goal attainment	15.78
5. Students follow the practices being taught	11.53
6. Observing students' growth and success over a period of time	3.53
7. The extent to which you are able objectively to evaluate your accomplishment	11.87
Growth	
8. Opportunities for increased responsibility in education	6.78
9. Opportunities provided for growth in education compared with growth in other fields	13.39
10. Participation in in-service education	7.99
11. Types and levels of in-service education	7.94
12. Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education	25.67**

Table 1 (Continued)

Item	x^2
13. Opportunities to attend professional conferences, workshops, etc.	17.69*
14. Opportunities for research	-
Interpersonal Relations	
15. The level of understanding that your superiors and you have of each other	-
16. Friendliness of your co-workers	4.68
17. Cooperation from faculty in your department	13.18
18. Cooperation from faculty outside your department	6.81
19. Faculty-student relationships	8.59
20. Overall institutional relations including faculty, students, and staff	10.45
21. Professional relationships on the job	8.53
22. Personal relationships on the job	4.77
Policy and Administration	
23. Your involvement in making decisions	12.30
24. The extent to which you are informed about matters affecting you	14.70
25. The procedures used to select faculty for promotion to positions such as department chairman	5.97
26. The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are made available to the faculty	13.63
27. The administrative procedures used to carry out the educational program	7.71

Table 1 (Continued)

Item	x^2
28. The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed	19.36*
29. The extent to which the policies meet faculty needs	6.83
30. The educational philosophy which prevails in your institution	5.37
Recognition	
31. Recognition of your accomplishments by co-workers	14.23+
32. Recognition of your accomplishments by superiors	13.78
33. Your recognition compared to that of your co-workers	10.99
34. The recognition you get from the administration for your ideas	14.35
35. Publicity given your work and activities	14.86
Responsibility	
36. The number of classes or groups for which you are responsible	7.99
37. The authority you have to get the job done	11.02
38. The total amount of responsibility you have	13.89
39. Your responsibilities compared with those of your co-workers	22.40*
40. Committee responsibilities	12.21
41. Responsibilities outside your major areas of interest	22.17*
Salary	
42. The method used to determine your salary	12.01

Table 1 (Continued)

Item	x^2
43. The range of salaries paid to instructors in your institution	10.49
44. The top salary avaibable to instructors compared to similar positions in other fields	7.71
45. Your salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions	13.77
46. The amount of your salary	17.38
47. The earning potential of the faculty compared to that of the administration	9.68
Supervision	
48. On-the-job supervision given by your superior	19.15+
49. Competence of your superiors to give leadership	36.37**
50. Personal encouragement given by your superior	14.64
51. The willingness of your superior to delegate authority	16.55
52. Authority delegated compared to duties delegated	15.28
53. Counsel and guidance given by your superiors	16.78
54 The initiation of innovations by your superiors	15.14
55. The fairness of your superiors	14.24
56. The sensitivity of your superiors to your needs	10.58
57. The consistency of your superiors	16.70
58. Specific on-the-job training offered by your superior	19.88+

Table 1 (Continued)

Item	χ^2
The Work Itself	
59. Work and association with college age students	-
60. The degree to which you work with an advisory committee to do your job	-
61. The interesting and challenging aspects of teaching	7.35
62. The general type of work you do	8.69
63. Your level of enthusiasm about teaching	7.61
Working Conditions	
64. The number of hours you work each week	17.02+
65. Your work schedule compared to that of similar positions in other fields	-
66. Your office facilities	23.82*
67. The adequacy of instructional equipment	9.33
68. The number of course preparations required	8.83
69. Your work schedule compared to that of your co-workers	15.90
70. Consider all aspects of your job as an instructor and indicate your total level of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction	14.53

* $P \leq .05$ with 10 df and 12 df

** $P \leq .01$ with 10 df

+ Approaching significance $P \leq .05$, with 10 df

- Undefined due to expected values in cells = 0

Limitations of the Study

The assumption that MBO/R procedures produced the changes in satisfaction or dissatisfaction identified in those items in which the null hypothesis was rejected is weakened by the fact that the initial test sample was limited to only 13 randomly selected faculty members. Unfortunately, interest in the instrument to assess faculty attitude changes as related to the implementation of MBO/R did not arise until the initial results of the Olin Wood samples were received a few months after the sample was taken. Also, the lack of a control group using a repeated measure design obviated the generation of data over equal time intervals, thus precluding the interpretation of the short and long-range influences of the MBO/R treatment on the variables.

Analysis of Results

Table 1 indicated rejection of the null hypothesis for nine of the 70 items ($P \leq .05$). Three items approached significance at the P.05 level of confidence. Taking a closer look at these items in terms of the different percentages of responses to the six categories of the scale by faculty members reveals marked differences over testing periods and response categories.

Item 3: "The adoption of practices which you recommend." A chi square value, with 10 degrees of freedom, is 18.74, which is significant at the P.05 level. Examination of the percentages revealed a significant migration to categories 5 and 6, indicating an increase in satisfaction the faculty feels with openness in the organization and with the degree to which recommednations from below are actually implemented. This is consistent with the participative management concept which is an intergral part of MBO/R, and seems to indicate faculty recognition of changes occuring in the organization.

Item 12: "Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education." A chi square value, with 10 degrees of freedom, is 25.67, which is significant at the P.01 level of confidence.

One of the major characteristics of MBO/R is that it provides for individuals to move toward self-actualization on the job, as defined by Maslow[3]. A necessary component for this to occur is the opportunity to continue self-development. One of the components of the MBO/R system at Wilson County Technical Institute is a broad program for personal development, based on the concept that every employee should have the opportunity

to develop those qualities and skills which make him more proficient in his job and which enable him to move up in the organization as his ability and ambition permit.

The migration of percentages from the dissatisfied categories to the satisfied categories on this variable seems to indicate faculty perception and acceptance of this policy and program.

Item 13: "Opportunities to attend professional conferences, workshops, etc." A chi square of 17.69, with 10 degrees of freedom, indicate significance at the P.05 level of confidence. Examination of the cells indicates a change in frequencies from the dissatisfied classes to the satisfied classes between the first and second testing with a mild recession from sixth to fourth categories in the third testing. Two aspects of MBO/R are most apparently associated with these responses. The personnel development program discussed with relation to item 12 is partially implemented through encouragement and financial support to attend conferences and professional meetings. A second significant aspect of the system in the submersion of budget management into the various levels of supervision within the organization. Thus, each department has its own budget, including travel budget, to administer in meeting its objectives for the year. Each employee is expected to develop his own personal development objective for the year, negotiated through his superior or department head. Included in this negotiations is the allocation of travel funds necessary to carry out the objectives.

The decrease noted between the second and third testing is probably attributable to the very tight budgetary constraints under which the Institute had operated during the last two fiscal years, due to a combination of unprecedented growth of enrollment coupled with underfunding of the

budget formula by the state legislature. Forced by these circumstances to tighten budgets and reexamine priorities, travel budgets were cut disproportionately in order to finance immediate instructional needs.

Item 28: "The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed." A chi square of 19.36, with 10 degrees of freedom, indicated significance at the P.05 level. This item is in the "Policy and Administration" classification, a "satisfier" item. From the first testing to the second testing, the percent of faculty expressing some degree of satisfaction with the item rose from 54% to 84%. It was during the period between the first and second testing that greatest attention was being paid to phase one of MBO/R implementation. The Institute's role and mission was reviewed and revised; every employee's job description was developed; and a manual of institution procedures was distributed to all personnel to inform them of policies and procedures in effect.

Item 31: "Recognition of your accomplishments by co-workers." A chi square value of 14.23 approached significance at the P.05 level of confidence. The percent of faculty expressing some degree of satisfaction on this variable went from 70% to 100% between the first and second testing.

Among the MBO/R procedures implemented at WCTI has been the establishment of periodic departmental and faculty meetings designed to facilitate and promote the sharing of ideas for improving instruction. "Sharing meetings" have also been held jointly with faculty groups from three neighboring technical institutes for the same goals. It is believed that these meetings have tended to influence faculty attitudes relating to this outcome.

The drop between the second and third testing may be an effect of the discontinuation of the sharing sessions with the other institutions and of the reduction in the opportunity to travel to other institutions reported in item 13. In any case, it is clear that faculty satisfaction with this item increased during the period of MBO/R implementation at Wilson County Technical Institute. This item is from the "Recognition" category identified by Herzberg as a "satisfier."

Item 39: "Your responsibilities compared with those of your co-workers." A chi square value of 22.40, with 12 degrees of freedom, is significant at $P \leq .05$. Examination of the percentages revealed decreases in slightly dissatisfied and moderately satisfied categories with corresponding increases in slightly satisfied and very satisfied categories between the first and second testing. There was a moderate shift from very satisfied back to moderately satisfied and from slightly satisfied into dissatisfied between the second and third testing. Overall, satisfaction went from 77% to 92% to 85% on test 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

The results again seem to correspond to the MBO/R implementation process. As previously mentioned, one of the first initiatives in the MBO/R implementation plan was review and definition of job responsibilities through the developmnet of role and mission statements and job responsibilities. There was concurrently a submission of decision-making power into the lower levels of the organization through the development of procedural guides to clarify and define the latitudes of action open to one. The result was a form of job enrichment which one would predict to result in a higher sense of satisfaction with one's job and a clearer understanding of one's responsibilities as they relate to those of one's co-workers. The test results seem to confirm that expectation.

Item 41: "Responsibilities outside your major areas of interest."

A chi square value of 22.17, with 12 degrees of freedom was significant at the P.05 level of confidence. This question is classified under the "Responsibility" category of Herzberg's "dissatisfiers" or "hygiene factors." Initially, 38% of the respondents indicated slight to moderate dissatisfaction with this item. On the second testing, the number was reduced to 20%; and on the third testing, to 16% (14% slightly dissatisfied and 2% very dissatisfied).

The procedures of MBO/R are designed to open communications in an organization and to provide an individual with the opportunity to examine, along with his supervisor, his responsibility and his supervisor's expectations of him. Job descriptions are reviewed and revised; special talents are identified and utilized; and individual objectives are developed consistent with the needs of the organization and of the individual. Theoretically, one has greater control over the determination of his responsibilities, and, therefore, should be able to remove most of the causes of dissatisfaction in this category provided he is not in an inappropriate job for his interests and abilities. The responses on this item seem to confirm the expected results from the MBO/R procedures.

Item 48: "On-the-job supervision given by your superior."

A chi square of 19.15, with 12 degrees of freedom, approached significance at the P.05 level of confidence. This item is in the "Supervision" category, a "dissatisfier" on Herzberg's list, so that end of the scale is examined first. The first testing produced a 48% response in some level of dissatisfaction. This dropped to 28% on second testing and 15% on third testing. The category with greatest change on the "satisfaction" side

was "moderately satisfied," which went from 0% to 36% to 42% respectively. It is assumed that some other variable acted to produce changes in the level of satisfaction-dissatisfaction on this item. Since the development of open communications and inter-dependent relationships between faculty and department heads is one of the essential processes for MBO/R to function properly, it seems reasonable to attribute the changes on this item to the very deliberate and concerted efforts to implement MBO/R.

Item 49: "Competence of your superiors to give leadership."

A chi square value of 36.37, with 12 degrees of freedom, was significant beyond the P.05 level of confidence. Another item related to "Supervision" on Herzberg's list of hygiene factors, the dissatisfaction side of the scale seems most indicative of the changes of attitude. On the first test, 69% of the respondents expressed a degree of dissatisfaction. The second test showed only 8% in this category, whereas, the third test showed an increase to 16%. The second test showed a fairly even distribution of satisfaction across the three categories. The drop on the third test was from slightly satisfied back to slightly dissatisfied. This result supports the theory that, as MBO/R has been implemented, there has been a decrease in dissatisfaction with supervision.

Item 58: "Specific on-the-job training offered by your superior."

A chi square value of 19.88, with 12 degrees of freedom, was significant at the P.05 level of confidence. Another item in the "Supervision" category, the percent of dissatiscation indicators was 46% on the first tests, 20% on the second test, and 25% on the third test. The greatest change on the dissatisfaction side was a drop from 23% to 4% to 0% in the "very dissatisfied" category. On the "satisfaction" side, the

"very satisfied" category went successively from 8% to 20% to 29%. This data seems to support the analysis of the preceding item.

Item 64: "The number of hours you work each week."

A chi square value of 17.02, with ten degrees of freedom, approached significance at the P.05 level of confidence. An item in the "working conditions" category, dissatisfaction is expressed by 46% on test one, 8% on test two, and 16% on test three. A review of occurences in the implementation of MBO/R which would likely diminish dissatisfaction on this item draws attention to the fact that, between test one and test two, a written personnel policy was developed by the administration and adopted by the board of trustees specifying for employees the conditions of employment and identifying sick leave and annual leave benefits. This was followed by an attempt to identify equitable teaching loads and to equalize work assignments for faculty in various programs.

Item 66: "Your office facilities."

A chi square value is 23.82, with 10 degrees of freedom, was significant at the P.05 level of confidence. Grouped under "working conditions," this "dissatisfier" item is the first instance of "negative" results encountered in the study. On the dissatisfaction side of the scale, the percentages drop from 15% to 4% and then rise to 27% on the third test. On the "satisfaction" end of the scale, the "very satisfied" category dropped from 60% to 17%, while the "moderately satisfied" category increased from 20% to 35% between the second and third tests.

Again, there are very obvious events which would lead one to expect the results cited. When MBO/R was initially implemented, renovations were made to create faculty offices , greatly improving the facilities. However,

during the last two years, the faculty has grown faster than facilities could be built, forcing many faculty members to share offices or to set up offices in the corner of their labs or shops. Thus, one might predict with a high degree of certainty that a faculty which has been urged to participate in management decisions of the institution would express dissatisfaction with deteriorating office conditions.

Summary and Conclusions

The chi square analysis identified nine items for which the null hypothesis of no significant differences existing among the six categories across the three testing periods was rejected at or beyond the P.05 level of confidence. An additional three items approached significance at the P.05 level of confidence and were worthy of analysis.

It is striking that, in every instance but one, the changes in the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction point to a decrease in the level of dissatisfaction of the faculty as it relates to the MBO/R treatment of the particular item. The one exception was a hygiene factor which deteriorated as a result of lack of adequate physical facilities to provide office space for additional faculty, due to increased enrollments.

In analyzing the distribution of the items into the ten categories, the heaviest concentration of significant items was in the area of "Supervision." Three items tended to indicate a significant change in the level of satisfaction the faculty felt toward their supervisors. Two items seemed to indicate increased satisfaction with their own "Responsibilities," and two items tended to show increased satisfaction with "Growth" opportunities. Other categories in which some improvements were indicated by percentage changes included: "Achievement," "Policy and Administration," "Recognition," and "Working Conditions." It is also of interest that the MBO/R treatment did not produce any significant level of negative change in faculty satisfaction-dissatisfaction as measured by the scale. Apparently, whatever positive benefits in effectiveness, efficiency, or organization quality which may have been derived from implementation of the MBO/R system were not achieved at the expense of decreased faculty satisfaction.

NOTES

[1]Olin R. Wood, "An Analysis of Faculty Motivation to Work in the North Carolina Community College System," a doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1973.

[2]Frederick Herzberg, B. Mausner, and B. Snyderman, The Motivation to Work (2nd ed., New York: John Wiley, John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1959), pp. 80-81 cited by Olin Wood, "Measuring Job Satisfaction of the Community College Staff," Community College Review, January, 1976, p. 58.

[3]Abraham H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality. (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1954), develops a theory of hierarchy of needs, listening progressively (1) physiological needs, (2) security and safety needs, (3) social, (4) ego needs and (5) self-actualization.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 22 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES